

## REMARKS

The present application was filed on February 26, 2004 with claims 1 through 20. Claims 1 through 20 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application prior to entry of the present amendment. The present amendment proposes to amend claims 2-5, 9-11 and 15-18 and cancel claims 1, 6-8, 12-14 and 19-20.

This amendment is submitted pursuant to 37 CFR §1.116 and should be entered. The Amendment places all of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-11, in a form that is believed allowable, and, in any event, in a better form for appeal. It is believed that examination of the pending claims as amended, which are consistent with the previous record herein, will not place any substantial burden on the Examiner. Applicants are merely amending dependent claims to include the limitations of the base claim. Thus, there are no new issues, since the Examiner has already considered this precise amended limitation in the original Office Action.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Salmonsens et al. (United States Publication Number 2004/0054689).

Applicants have amended dependent claims 5, 11 and 18 to make them independent claims by including all of the limitations of the corresponding base claim. Claims 5, 11 and 18 indicate that the high speed communications between the host computer and peripheral device conform to a USB standard. With regard to claim 5, for example, the Examiner asserts that Salmonsens et al. teaches a controller wherein said high speed communications conform to a USB standard (citing page 3, par. 0035). Par. 0035 notes that the interface controller 210 has a USB link 224. The USB link 224 is for communications with an external device (not shown). The USB link 224, however, is **not** for high speed communications between the host computer (Fig. 3, 342) and a peripheral device (Fig. 2, 202).

Each independent claim 5, 11 and 18, following entry of the present amendments require that the high speed communications between the host computer and peripheral device conform to a USB standard. In Salmonsens et al., however, the communications between the host computer (Fig. 3, 342) and a peripheral device (Fig. 2, 202) are clearly over a wide area network 320.

Thus, Salmonsens et al. do not disclose or suggest a controller for high speed communications between a host computer and at least one peripheral device where the high speed communications between the host computer and peripheral device conform to a USB standard, as required by each independent claim 5, 11 and 18, as amended.

As noted in the Background section of the present application, conventional peripheral

devices typically include a USB device controller that allows the peripheral device to communicate with the host computer over the USB bus. USB device controllers typically include a dedicated processor to perform USB functions, such as transmit, receive and interrupt functions. In addition, the peripheral devices typically include a primary microprocessor for performing the normal functions of the peripheral device, resulting in increased size and manufacturing costs and an inefficient use of processing resources. One aspect of the present invention provides a USB device controller that *shares processing resources* with the primary peripheral processor.

Each independent claim requires that the processor in the controller processor "performs at least one function for said peripheral device in addition to said one or more communication functions." Thus, the processor must control communications on a USB bus using one or more communication functions, and *also perform at least one function for said peripheral device*

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of new independent claims 5, 11 and 18, as amended.

#### Dependent Claims

Claims 2-4, 9-10 and 15-17 are dependent on independent claims 5, 11 and 18, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Salmonsens et al. because of their dependency from independent claims 5, 11 and 18 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims 2-5, 9-11 and 15-18, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 5, 2007

Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560